

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA GREENVILLE DIVISION

| MELVIN A. BROWN, | §   |                                   |
|------------------|-----|-----------------------------------|
| Petitioner,      | §   |                                   |
|                  | §   |                                   |
| VS.              | § C | CIVIL ACTION NO. 6:19-605-MGL-KFM |
|                  | §   |                                   |
|                  | §   |                                   |
| MARK BOLSTER,    | §   |                                   |
| Respondent.      | §   |                                   |

## ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION AND TRANSFERRING THIS MATTER TO THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

Petitioner Melvin A. Brown (Brown), who is self represented, filed this as a 28 U.S.C. § 2241 action. The case is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) of the United States Magistrate Judge suggesting the Court transfer the matter to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia for all further proceedings. The Report was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court may

accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The Magistrate Judge filed the Report on March 7, 2019, but Brown failed to file any objections to the Report. "[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation." *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note). Moreover, a failure to object waives appellate review. *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case pursuant to the standard set forth above, the Court adopts the Report and incorporates it herein. Therefore, it is the judgment of the Court this matter is **TRANSFERRED** to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia for all further proceedings.

To the extent Brown requests a certificate of appealability from this Court, that certificate is **DENIED**.

## IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed this 25th day of June, 2019, in Columbia, South Carolina.

s/ Mary Geiger Lewis
MARY GEIGER LEWIS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

\*\*\*\*

## NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this Order within sixty days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.